UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/771,143	01/26/2001	Christopher Crim	CLARP027/P2616	6194

22434 7590 12/20/2002

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, TAM V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/771,143	CRIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tam V Nguyen	2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 January 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-32 are pending in this office action. Claims 1-32 are presented for examination. This office action is in response to the filling dated 1/26/2001.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (e) the invention was described in-
> (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
> (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

3. Claims 1-4, 6-9, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ananda (US 6385731B2).

With respect to claims 1 and 28, Ananda discloses a method of controlling access to records stored in a database, said method comprising: defining at least one expression associated with at least one record of said database, (col. 3, lines 18-34, one expression is a user password); evaluating said at least one expression for said at least one record, (col. 3, lines 18-34, Ananda shows the user validation module compares the password with the password stored in the user registration database for the user); and allowing access to said at least one record based on said evaluating of said at least one expression, (col. 3, lines 18-34, Ananda shows when the password is validated, the controller of the

central rental facility establishes continuous connection; otherwise, communications with the remote computer are terminated).

As to claim 2, a method as recited in claim 1, wherein said at least one expression is a calculation expression that can be evaluated at least partly based on a value of at least one field of said at least one record, (col. 3, lines 18-34).

As to claim 3, a method as recited in claim 1, wherein said at least one expression is a calculation expression that can be evaluated at least partly based on at least one state variable of said database, (col. 3, lines 18-34).

As to claims 4 and 29, a method as recited in claim 1, wherein said at least one expression can be defined based on fields and state variables of said database, and wherein said evaluating operates to return only one of two possible values, one of said possible values indicating that access to said at least one record should be granted, and the other one of said possible values indicating that access to said at least one record should be denied, (col. 3, lines 18-34).

As to claim 6, a method as recited in claim 1, wherein said defining of said at least one expression defines access privileges for a user of said database with respect to accessing one or more records of said database, (col. 3, lines 18-34).

As to claim 7, a method as recited in claim 1, wherein said defining of said at least one expression operates to define access privileges for a user of said database with respect to at least one operation that can be performed on one or more records of said database, (col. 3, lines 18-34).

As to claims 8 and 30, a method as recited in claim 1, wherein said defining of said expression defines access privileges for at least one user of said database with respect to access to one or more records in said database, (col. 3, lines 18-34), and wherein said defining of said expression operates to define access privileges with respect to at least one operation that may be requested to be performed by said at least one user on one or more records of said database, (col. 3, lines 18-34).

As to claims 9 and 31, a method as recited in claim 8, wherein said at least one user is assigned a password that is associated with said expression, (col. 3, lines 18-34).

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 16-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Balint et al. (US 5542024).

With respect to claim 16, Balint discloses a database system, said database system comprising: a database having one or more records stored therein, (col. 22, lines 27-48); a database program including a Graphical User Interface that can be used to facilitate operations on said one or more records stored in said database, (col. 22, lines 27-48); and wherein said Graphical User Interface operates to facilitate defining access privileges with respect to said one or more records stored in said database, (col. 22, lines 27-48).

As to claim 17, a database system as recited in claim 16, wherein said Graphical User Interface operates to provide the ability for a user of said database to define an expression associated with at least one operation that may be requested to be performed by another user of said database on said one or more records stored in said database, (col. 22, lines 27-48).

As to claim 18, a database system as recited in claim 16, wherein said Graphical User Interface operates to provide the ability for a user to define said expression without requiring said user to write a programming script, (col. 22, lines 27-48).

As to claim 19, a database system as recited in claim 16, wherein said Graphical User Interface provides a window that allows a user to interact with said Graphical User Interface to identify a password for which access privileges may be defined or re-defined, (col. 22, lines 27-48).

As to claim 20, a database system as recited in claim 19, wherein said Graphical User Interface further provides a window that allows a user to specify a calculation expression which defines access privileges with respect to at least one operation that may be requested to be performed on said one or more records, (col. 22, lines 27-48).

As to claims 21 and 26, a database system as recited in claim 20, wherein said at least one operation can be a browse, edit, or a delete operation, (col. 3, lines 16-21).

As to claim 22, a database system as recited in claim 20, wherein said calculation expression can be evaluated at least partly based on a value in at least one field of said one or more records of said database, and wherein said calculation expression can be evaluated at least partly based on at least one state variable of said database, (col. 22, lines 16-21).

As to claim 23, a database system as recited in claim 16, wherein said database program operates to determine whether access to at least one of said one or more records should be granted or denied, (col. 22, lines 27-48).

As to claim 24, a database system as recited in claim 23, wherein said determining of whether access to said at least one record should be granted or denied

is performed by evaluating a calculation expression for said at least one of said one record, (col. 22, lines 27-48).

As to claim 25, a database system as recited in claim 24, wherein access to said at least one record is granted only when said determining determines that access should be granted, and wherein access to said at least one record is denied when said determining determines that access should be denied for said record, (col. 22, lines 27-48).

As to claim 27, a database system as recited in claim 24, wherein said database system further comprises a cache, and wherein said cache operates to store an evaluated result of at least one calculation expression, (col. 22, lines 27-48).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 5 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ananda (US 6385731B2) in view of Schaefer et al. (US 5826268).

As to claim 5, Ananda does not explicitly teach, "a method as recited in claim 1, wherein said evaluation is performed only when a request to access said at least one record has been received."

However, Schaefer shows the record on "James Bond" may be visible at level U, and at level U we can see a set of "MI-6 employee". However, the fact the Bond works for MI-6 is a member of the employee set, should be visible only at level S or above. The fact that Bond is infiltrating may be classified T so that the Bond record appears in both set. Such invisible super types help to preserve data confidential, (col. 10, lines 3-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teaching of Ananda with the teaching of Schaefer because many databases containing sensitive data are likely to be accessible through a computer network or internet work, thereby exposing those databases to entities which may attempt to comprise the confidential of the sensitive data.

With respect to claim 11, Ananda discloses a method of controlling access to records stored in a database, said method comprising: identifying a password that is associated with one or more users of said database, (col. 3, lines 19-34); receiving a request to perform said at least one operation on one or more records of said database, said request being identified as a request made by said one or more users associated with said password, (col. 3, lines 19-34); evaluating said calculation expression when said request has been received, (col. 3, lines 19-34); said evaluation returning only one

of two possible values, one of said to possible values indicating that said at least one operation should be granted and another one of said possible values indicating that said at least one operation should be denied, (col. 3, lines 19-34); granting said at least one operation to be performed when said evaluation returns one said possible value to Indicate that said at least one operation should be granted, (col. 3, lines 19-34) ; and denying said at least one operation to be performed when said evaluation returns one said another possible value to indicate that said at least one operation should be denied, (col. 3, lines 19-34).

Ananda does not clearly disclose "defining a calculation expression for said identified password, said calculation expression defining access privileges of said one or more users with respect to at least one operation that may be requested to be performed by said one or more users on one or more records of said database."

However, Schaefer shows the record on "James Bond" may be visible at level U, and at level U we can see a set of "MI-6 employee". However, the fact the Bond works for MI-6 is a member of the employee set, should be visible only at level S or above. The fact that Bond is infiltrating may be classified T so that the Bond record appears in both set. Such invisible super types help to preserve data confidential, (col. 10, lines 3-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teaching of Ananda with the teaching of Schaefer because many databases containing sensitive data are likely to be accessible

through a computer network or internet work, thereby exposing those databases to entities which may attempt to comprise the confidential of the sensitive data.

As to claim 13, a method as recited in claim 1, Ananda further discloses wherein said calculation expression is not explicitly defined for said at least one operation but said calculation expression is one that has been defined for another operation which has been considered as a related operation to said at least one operation, (col. 3, lines 19-34).

As to claim 14, Ananda further discloses a method as recited in claim 11, wherein said calculation expression can be evaluated at least partly based on a value of at least one field of said at least one record, and wherein said calculation expression can be evaluated at least partly based on at least one state variable of said database, (col. 3, lines 19-34).

As to claim 15, Ananda does not teach "a method as recited in claim 14, wherein said method further comprises: granting temporary or limited access to said at least one record to allow said evaluating of said calculation expression."

However, Schaefer shows the record on "James Bond" may be visible at level U, and at level U we can see a set of "MI-6 employee". However, the fact the Bond works for MI-6 is a member of the employee set, should be visible only at level S or above. The fact that Bond is infiltrating may be classified T so that the Bond record appears in

both set. Such invisible super types help to preserve data confidential, (col. 10, lines 3-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teaching of Ananda with the teaching of Schaefer because password protection and access lists of user having permission to access a particular piece of data my be employed to prevent unauthorized retrieval of the sensitive data.

8. Claims 10 and 32, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ananda (US 6385731B2) in view of Shurt (US 5572673).

As to claims 10 and 32, Anada does not disclose "a method as recited in claim 1, wherein access to said at least one record can be for browsing, editing, or deleting of said at least one record."

However, Shurts shows the database is divided into two tables, a first "unclassified" table accessible to all customers and a second "secret" table inaccessible to most customers. The retailer sometimes grant the right access more sensitive information for the limited purpose of updating their price and other supply information, (col. 6, lines 35-col. 7, lines 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teaching of Ananda with the teaching of Shurts because the owner or administrator grants specified users permission to execute

specified commands and to access specified tables, views, and columns. So no one can update without the owner or the administrator permission.

9. Claim 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ananda (US 6385731B1) in view of Schaefer et al. (US 5826268) and further in view of Shurts (US 5572673).

As to claim 12, Ananda and Schaefer do not disclose "a method as recited in claim 1, wherein access to said at least one record can be for browsing, editing, or deleting of said at least one record."

However, Shurts shows the database is divided into two tables, a first "unclassified" table accessible to all customers and a second "secret" table inaccessible to most customers. The retailer sometimes grant the right access more sensitive information for the limited purpose of updating their price and other supply information, (col. 6, lines 35-col. 7, lines 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teaching of Ananda with the teaching of Schaefer and further with the teaching of Shurts because the owner or administrator grants specified users permission to execute specified commands and to access specified tables, views, and columns. So no one can update without the owner or the administrator permission.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

McNabb et al. (US 6289462B1) shows trusted compartmentalized computer operating system.

Lloyd (US 6460041B1) shows browser-based database-access engine apparatus and method.

Contact Information

11. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam V Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM-5: 00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Yen Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for formal communications and (703) 746-7240 for informal communications.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia 22202. Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

12. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

TV:tv

12/10/02

JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER